UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, . Case No. 13-CR-00362

VS.

GERSHON BARKANY, . 824 Federal Plaza . Central Islip, NY

Defendant. . June 26, 2013

. **.** .

TRANSCRIPT OF PLEA HEARING
BEFORE HONORABLE ARLENE R. LINDSAY
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

For The Government UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS OFFICE

EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

BY: CHRISTOPHER C. CAFFARONE, ESQ

610 Federal Plaza

Central Islip, NY 11722

For The Defendant: BARKET MARION EPSTEIN & KEARON, LLP

BY: BRUCE BARKET, ESQ.

666 Old Country Road, Suite 700

Garden City, New York

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording, transcript produced by transcription service.

TERRY GRIBBEN'S TRANSCRIPTION SERVICE
27 Beach Road, Unit 4
Monmouth Beach, NJ 07750
(732) 263-0044 Fax No. 732-263-0075
800 603-6212

www.tgribbentranscription.com

Case 2:13-ci	r-00362-L	.DW-ARL	Document 44	Filed 07/24/13	Page 2 of 73 PageID #: 146
1			T N	DEX	
2			1 1/	р п и	
	VITNESS				COURT
4					
	SERSHON	BARKANY			39
6					
7					
8					
9					
10					
11					
12					
13					
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
26					

Colloguy

COURT CLERK: Calling 2013-CR-362, the United States of America against Gershon Barkany. Please state your appearances.

MR. CAFFARONE: Chris Caffarone for the United States. Good afternoon Your Honor.

THE COURT: Yes, good afternoon.

the Government have a joint application to have the

MR. BARKET: Good afternoon Your Honor, Bruce Barket for Mr. Barkany.

THE COURT: All right, good afternoon Mr. Barket.

So Mr. Caffarone what is the Government's application today?

MR. CAFFARONE: Yes, Your Honor. The defendant and

defendant's bail modified. Currently he's on home detention.

The modification would change the home detention to a curfew which allows him to be out to work or allows him to be out between the hours of 6:00 a.m. and midnight with an electronic monitoring bracelet that will be triggered if he's not in the residence between the hours I guess of midnight and 6:00 a.m.

The other addition was a travel enhancement. We'd allow him to travel not only in the eastern and southern districts of New York but also the District of New Jersey where his parents reside.

And then the final restriction was a restriction to address his gambling problem which he has a history of having

Colloquy

a gambling issue. We'd ask that Your Honor impose a restriction that he not gamble or enter any gambling establishments. And this will allow him hopefully to work and potentially repay some of the victims that have not been repaid to date. So we believe that this is a reasonable condition. We ask that Your Honor endorse the application.

THE COURT: What's the expectation as to where he's going to work?

MR. CAFFARONE: He has a number of business deals it's my understanding. He can address this better. That don't, they're not done out of the office. He has to go to business meetings in the city. He may have to also travel through New Jersey for some of these deals. I don't know the specifics.

THE COURT: Well Mr. Caffarone I'm concerned here.

Because one of the, you know, the obvious allegations here
that, you know, he engaged in investor fraud to the extent of
\$60 million. Is he going to be involved in investments
again?

MR. CAFFARONE: Your Honor I believe the deals, obviously there is the risk that he go and commit more fraud. I believe that that risk is not great because he's going to be monitored by his attorney.

THE COURT: By who?

MR. CAFFARONE: By Mr. Barket. Is going to make

Colloquy

sure that this defendant, who's going to plead guilty and going to be facing, he's going to be out on bail. He's got Judge Wexler who is presiding over his case. If this defendant goes and while he's on bail commits more fraud, the penalties are going to be severe. And I think he understands that. In my meeting with him I think he understood that.

I know Mr. Barket is putting this defendant in a position that he hopes to be able to make full restitution or be able to argue to Judge Wexler that he's made great strides. He's met with the government and agreed to cooperate with us to try to trace money that he took from victims with the hopes that we can get that money back and repay victims.

He worked with the first set of victims before the government had even arrested him to try to get them money back. He voluntarily gave over assets. He voluntarily gave over some monies.

So my hope, obviously I'm not clairvoyant. But those risks are enormous for him. If he were to go and commit more fraud while he's out, he's going to be in a very, very bad situation when it comes time to be sentenced before Judge Wexler.

And I think that the government feels comfortable taking that risk here, because I believe Mr. Barket is involved. I believe he's going to insure that that doesn't

happen. And if it does, there are going to be severe penalties.

THE COURT: And how, Mr. Barket how are you going to insure that doesn't happen? Are you going to obtain reports from your client as to what he's involved in?

MR. BARKET: Yes, Your Honor. Obviously the purpose here is to raise funds, significant funds, to --

THE COURT: That's my concern.

MR. BARKET: To repay the investors that lost money when they invested with him in, during the course of the fraud. So there's going to be a microscope on all of the transactions he's involved in.

THE COURT: Who's going to be behind the microscope?

MR. BARKET: Well initially the transactional lawyers that we're going to hire to do the transactional work. And then my firm, as we deal with the proceeds of this. Because we're going to be taking the proceeds of the investments or the business deals and transferring them to the government or ultimately to the investors. None of us --

THE COURT: So when you say your firm, are you suggesting that you're going to assume responsibility here for the defendant's transactions. And at least monitor his transactions in such a way as to assure, insure that there is no additional fraud? Are you going that far?

MR. BARKET: I'm certainly doing those things. The

Colloquy

part of the responsibility, -- there's no -- we spoke about this in putting together this application and whether or not he submit to the government each of the investments or investment activities he was involved in for them to review. Whether they're going to submit it to us.

And the resolution was that we would be, my firm would be looking at the transactions to make sure that they were not fraudulent in the second instance.

THE COURT: And why did the government choose not to get involved in that?

MR. CAFFARONE: Well Your Honor --

THE COURT: Or is that not a choice?

MR. CAFFARONE: No, we were offered that choice.

And the government is not going to monitor all his business dealings to determine whether they are fraudulent or not.

We're not going to give declaratory judgments, signing off on a deal.

I spoke with the FBI agent on the case and we trust the defendant to know the difference between a fraudulent deal, a legitimate deal and a fraudulent one. We trust Mr. Barket to know the difference between a fraud and not a fraud.

This case was pretty straightforward in -- I mean it doesn't take someone with Mr. Haggerty's experience to know whether this was a fraud or not. He said there were

deals. There were no deals.

If Mr. Barket is doing his due diligence which I have no reason to believe he won't, he should be able to realize this is a deal you can do, this is a deal you cannot. But we don't want to --

THE COURT: I'm confounded by the Government's position. You know, if the charge wasn't that this gentleman, Mr. Barkany, had engaged in, you know, in a fraud inducing investors to invest \$60 million. So obviously, you know, he's got the wherewithal to get people of substantial means to make investments with him on virtually nothing.

I mean it sounds from my reading of the information, he induced people to invest in deals that didn't exist. I'm not so sure, I'm having difficulty understanding your application to release him to go do business of a substantial nature. Because presumably this is meant to cure some of the losses that the victims incurred in this scam that's charged.

So send him out there to go and engage in a substantial amount of business without some oversight. Now I understand Mr. Barket's firm is willing to get involved and do what it can to, or what they can to oversee the thing. But the Government's decision to just take a hand's off approach because you don't want to be involved in monitoring, is confounding to the Court.

Colloquy

MR. BARKET: It actually, if I may Judge, it actually in discussing this with the Government, it actually ended up making more sense for us to look at this rather than the government. Because you wouldn't want to have the Government, you wouldn't want to give Mr. Barkany, if I can phrase this correctly, an added plus having been involved.

In other words, you wouldn't want to be able to have him say to the investors or people he's dealing with who are going to know about his history, -- you wouldn't want them to be able to say to them well look, you know that this particular deal is good because the FBI has signed off on it.

That would --

I don't think the FBI's going to sign off on anything.

Neither is the Government going to sign off on anything. But what the Government can at least take a look at is to make sure, I mean the prior scam was he got people to invest in real estate deals and he never purchased real estate. There was no such thing. It was air.

I mean at least the Government would be able to insure we're not engaging in air deals again.

MR. BARKET: No, well certainly we'll be able to insure that. That part is relatively --

THE COURT: And are you committed to doing what if you discover that the defendant's involved in further elicit

Colloquy

transactions? What are you, -- what steps is your firm prepared to take? Have you thought that one through? Are you going to reveal it to the Government?

MR. BARKET: Your Honor, there is a two year history here. Part of which I don't think is in the complaint, is that the original fraud here for about \$56 million was self-disclosed in part by Mr. Barkany to the investors.

He then met with them, signed off on a confession of judgment and a number of other things. And literally worked with them over a couple of years to get back to them somewhere between, depending on the value of the assets, somewhere between \$15 and \$30 million.

Then he was arrested. He's not been, curiously, prohibited from engaging in business for the last several months by a condition of the bail. What he has been prohibited from doing is leaving his house with some exceptions.

What we're proposing now is to have his travel be increased or unlimited within the three districts that we spoke of. The condition concerning his ability to work or not is actually not one of the things that we're going to, we're seeking to change because it's not, it wasn't previously prohibited.

THE COURT: Well it wasn't previously prohibited in my opinion because the Court at that time saw that this man

Colloguy

was on lock down and under house arrest. And so his ability to engage in business and meet clients and develop the kind of business that is charged in the information, was going to be really very, very restricted based on the conditions of confinement.

MR. BARKET: And --

THE COURT: But now I'm being asked to permit this defendant to have basically freedom, you know, from 6:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. which is presumably well beyond the amount of the normal workday schedule. So he's, so there really isn't much of a restriction. And to the extent that he's out and about -- and with the specific purpose of putting him out there to engage in business. Now that's what's going on.

And so you've offered to monitor the defendant's activities. But I want to know, -- okay, you monitor the defendant's activities which gives the Court some assurance that there's been, there's some oversight because the Government doesn't want to get involved with it.

But what are you going to do if you discover that the defendant is at it again? What are you prepared to do?

MR. BARKET: Obviously we're not going to participate at all in the, in any such thing. And within the rules, ethical rules, we'd have to comply with the ethical rules. We wouldn't be free to breach those in any way.

THE COURT: So you wouldn't be telling the Government there's a problem, right? And you wouldn't be telling the potential victims there's a problem?

MR. BARKET: Well, but there's --

THE COURT: Am I correct?

MR. BARKET: I don't think that there's a way that we would be able to discover the fraud without, with the fraud being committed.

The kind of deals and business investments that he has proposed involve, will involve, -- the transactional lawyers won't be of our firm. They'll be of much larger firms probably in Manhattan, that will do the transactional work for him. We'll be monitoring what happens with that. The idea that somehow he would engage in some fraud, flagrant fraud and that I would find out about it, seems, anything is possible. But it seems --

THE COURT: You're right. It would be more than unwise for him to do that, I understand that. But we are dealing with a defendant who has done this, okay. So it's not something outside his character, let's put it that way.

Although I'm not trying to assign a specific character to the defendant. But we now have, I mean very reliable information, probable cause to believe because he hasn't pled guilty yet, but at least probable cause to believe that he's engaged in this kind of fraud.

Colloguy 13

So when you tell me that you're prepared to monitor, monitoring means nothing unless the monitor has some ability to take action. And you don't.

MR. BARKET: Excuse me for one second.

THE COURT: I mean that's a concern I have. I mean I understand --

MR. BARKET: I'm sorry, I just wanted to speak, my client wants to speak to me.

THE COURT: Yes, go ahead.

(Counsel and client confer)

MR. BARKET: Thank you. Just so the Court is aware of what's going, Mr. Barkany is willing to sign a waiver allowing for the disclosure if we discover fraud in the business dealings. Frankly and I appreciate that. It certainly is consistent with what I, if I'd asked him, I'm sure, I would have imagined he would have agreed to that.

But my concern with my firm being in some kind of quasi law enforcement role where not only --

THE COURT: But you volunteered to do it Mr. Barket.

MR. BARKET: If I may Judge.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. BARKET: I volunteered, and we've set this up so that we would be, -- because we're going to be involved in the transactions because the money is going to be coming to us.

Colloguy

THE COURT: Right.

MR. BARKET: To repay the investors. So I'm going to have to know the source of the money. I'm obviously going to be dealing with a regular basis with whoever does the transactional work for him. Some of these things, most of them are rather complicated. And so I'll know what's going on.

THE COURT: But your knowledge is going to be transmitted to whom, if there's a problem?

MR. BARKET: My knowledge would be secondary to the knowledge of the transactional lawyers who would have to be involved in the fraud as well.

THE COURT: But their job is not to monitor. Your job is to monitor.

MR. BARKET: But the lawyers, it's not as if the lawyers other than the fact that they're monitoring would be free to participate --

THE COURT: Mr. Barket I can't accept that. That package doesn't work for me, okay. You're telling me that, you proposed something with the Government. And the proposal is that to the extent that the concern of the Court is that this defendant is going to be released and encouraged to go out and conduct business, business transactions perhaps of the very same type that he's charged with defrauding investors.

Colloquy

And I'm not saying he's going to go out and engage in fraud. I'm not presuming that at all. But to the extent that the Court had a concern that somebody be looking over the defendant's shoulders or at least examining some of these transactions to make sure that we don't wind up with a whole new crop of victims, you have offered or, you know, made the suggestion that your firm be the monitor to make sure that this doesn't happen again.

And the monitor's role, when you say to the Court that I will be a monitor, implies that if you found evidence of some problem, that you would take steps to either advise the Government, inform the Court, put a stop to it, tell the victims, -- whatever that step might be. But you have, you've indicated to the Court you're not willing to take those steps because of the attorney/client privilege.

MR. BARKET: No, I'm --

THE COURT: But the monitoring -- let me finish. So the monitoring role means nothing. It means that you're the one with the information, but you don't pass it on to anybody.

MR. BARKET: Judge, what I was saying before is that we would only be aware of such a thing secondarily.

Because the transactional lawyers --

THE COURT: I am not going to rely on lawyers not before me.

Colloquy 16 MR. BARKET: But --1 2 THE COURT: If transactional lawyers were to come into this courtroom and say Judge we'll be prepared to take 3 that role, fine. But you're offering to take the role. 4 5 MR. BARKET: But --THE COURT: I'm not going down that path so don't 6 7 even, you can make the argument. MR. BARKET: I'm not making an argument Judge. All 8 9 I'm doing is asking, let me complete my thought. THE COURT: I'm not going to presume that lawyers 10 11 who are not in front of me, -- transactional lawyers, are 12 going to be looking with an eye towards whether or not 13 there's a problem, a fraudulent problem with the -14 MR. BARKET: Could we have a brief recess Judge? 15 THE COURT: Yes. 16 (Recording paused at 12:08:00) 17 (Recording resumes at 12:24:53) 18 THE COURT: All right, we've had a brief recess. 19 Does anyone want to add anything? 20 MR. CAFFARONE: Nothing from the Government Your 21 Honor. 22 MR. BARKET: Mr. Barkany is actually insisting that

MR. BARKET: Mr. Barkany is actually insisting that I go forward with what he proposed. So I'm his attorney and I will do as he's instructed. Which is, that if our firm becomes aware of fraud, he has authorized and in fact

23

24

25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Colloquy 17 directed that we disclose it to the U.S. Attorney's Office. And that would be a condition of the package I suppose. THE COURT: All right. Mr. Caffarone. MR. CAFFARONE: Well, I have nothing to add if he's -- I don't have any objection to that. THE COURT: All right, so the package would be that the million dollar bond would continue, correct? MR. CAFFARONE: Correct. THE COURT: That the travel would be eastern and southern districts as well as New Jersey. Now, let me just ask something. How many times have you appeared before Judge, before other judges to seek a modification of the bail? MR. CAFFARONE: We haven't. The only requests have been in letters where Mr. Barkany has asked to go to his office or other, or recently when his wife had a child. But we haven't actually had court appearances. The only time we've had Court was for the initial appearance. And then there was a waiver that was before Judge Wall. And then there was a bail package presented to Magistrate Judge Tomlinson. So there were, I think we've been before the Court three times.

THE COURT: All right, now where specifically in New Jersey does the family reside?

MR. BARKET: Just north of exit 90.

Colloquy 18 THE COURT: Do you know what district that might be? 1 MR. BARKET: There's one district in New Jersey. 2 3 THE COURT: There's only one? MR. CAFFARONE: Right. 4 5 THE COURT: Has the defendant's passport been 6 surrendered already? 7 MR. CAFFARONE: Yes, Your Honor. 8 MR. BARKET: Yes, Your Honor. 9 THE COURT: All right, I'm reviewing the conditions that were entered by the previous judicial officer who heard 10 11 the application for bail. And that was Judge Tomlinson. 12 She imposed conditions that the defendant was to 13 undergo a mental health evaluation by a certified mental health provider. Has that been done? 14 15 MR. BARKET: Yes, Your Honor. 16 THE COURT: And was the report issued to the Court 17 within 30 days? 18 MR. BARKET: I believe so. We haven't seen it. I believe it was issued. He did that almost immediately upon 19 20 being released. THE COURT: Mr. Caffarone? 21 22 MR. CAFFARONE: (inaudible 12:29:24) 23 THE COURT: I did not see anything in the file. Yes, you are whom? 24 25 OFFICER BORKE: Officer Borke (phonetic) from

Colloquy 19 pretrial services. 1 2 THE COURT: Okay. OFFICER BORKE: Mr. Barkany did participate in a 3 mental health evaluation with First Light Psychological. 4 THE COURT: Okay. 5 OFFICER BORKE: I'm just reviewing it here. And I 6 7 do know that it was submitted to Judge Tomlinson's chambers. 8 THE COURT: All right. 9 OFFICER BORKE: And that was back --THE COURT: And so a report was issued? 10 11 OFFICER BORKE: It was. 12 THE COURT: Okay. 13 OFFICER BORKE: That was back in April. 14 THE COURT: And let me just ask, the reporting 15 requirement as directed by pretrial services, what was the 16 arrangement with respect to reporting? OFFICER BORKE: (inaudible - not on microphone) 17 18 THE COURT: Once a month? 19 OFFICER BORKE: (inaudible) 20 THE COURT: So that reporting requirement is to continue. And so once a month at pretrial services. And you 21 22 will be visiting the defendant at his home once a month. 23 OFFICER BORKE: Yes, it's (inaudible) 24 THE COURT: I'm sorry, can you get near the 25 microphone? I'm having trouble hearing you.

Colloquy 20 OFFICER BORKE: Sure. If you would like to add 1 2 that pretrial is permitted to visit him at his place of 3 employment. We would do that as well if you wish. THE COURT: Yes, I'm going to add that. 4 5 OFFICER BORKE: Okay. 6 THE COURT: Do we have a place of employment? 7 OFFICER BORKE: That I do not, I'm not aware of. THE COURT: Is there a placement of employment Mr. 8 9 Barket? MR. BARKET: We actually closed his office shortly 10 11 after his arrest and we'll reopen another one. So we'll give 12 that to them once we're able to do it. 13 THE COURT: All right. 14 MR. BARKET: He hasn't obviously been able to set 15 that up because of the conditions thus far. THE COURT: All right. So if he sets up an office 16 17 of employment, he is to report that to pretrial services. And they may randomly visit that office. 18 19 In addition it seems as though Judge Tomlinson 20 posed the requirement of financial disclosure of bank accounts and financial assets. 21 MR. BARKET: Not all. The ones, any bank accounts 22 23 or assets outside the country and there are none. 24 THE COURT: Right. Has that been done?

MR. BARKET: Well there are none, so yes.

25

Colloquy 21 THE COURT: And I think that's it. Was there 1 2 anything else that pretrial services is aware of? OFFICER BORKE: Not that I'm aware of. 3 THE COURT: Okay. 4 5 MR. CAFFARONE: Your Honor there were properties 6 posted that should remain on the bond as well. 7 THE COURT: Right. I want to speak to the sureators who are signators to the surety bond, assuming they're the 8 9 same individuals. Are they the same people? 10 MR. BARKET: Yes, yes, Your Honor. 11 THE COURT: And they posted the, as surety, the 12 premises located at 17 Locust Hollow Drive in Muncie, is that 13 right? 14 MR. BARKET: Yes. 15 THE COURT: And is this property under some kind of 16 a trust? 17 MR. BARKET: Yes. 18 THE COURT: So how can it be pledged as property? 19 MR. BARKET: The trustee is the, Mr. Sklar 20 (phonetic) came in and represented to the Court that he had the authority and the ability to place it as security for a 21 22 bond. And we have the four beneficiaries of the trust all 23 sign off on it. 24 THE COURT: All right. So that was done and are 25 they all here?

Colloquy 22 MR. BARKET: Well the trustee submitted an 1 2 affidavit. One of the beneficiaries is in Baltimore. We did 3 that by affidavit the first time. We have another one today. And then there are, the other trustees are here. 4 5 Excuse me, the other beneficiaries of the trust are here as well as his mother-in-law and father-in-law who also signed 6 off on the bond. 7 8 THE COURT: And the trustee is present or not 9 present? 10 MR. BARKET: He is not present. 11 THE COURT: All right. So you have prior 12 representation from the trustee that he had the authority to 13 pledge the property. 14 MR. BARKET: Correct. 15 THE COURT: You have the beneficiaries of the trust 16 either present or by affidavit? MR. BARKET: Correct. 17 18 THE COURT: And where is that affidavit? 19 MR. BARKET: That should be with the Court. I have 20 two here. THE COURT: Is this a newly signed affidavit? 21 22 MR. BARKET: There are two new ones. There are two

new ones, -- one from Juda Zellinger (phonetic) who is one of

the beneficiaries of the trust who resides in Baltimore. And

the trustee, Daniel Sklar. Sklar.

23

24

25

Colloquy 23 THE COURT: Let me see what you have. No, these are 1 2 the old ones. I don't want the old ones. 3 MR. BARKET: I'm sorry Judge. The one from Mr. Sklar is an original that we have. 4 5 (pause in proceedings) THE COURT: And who are the other signators on the 6 7 bond? There's a Delma Rosen, Rosenni (phonetic)? I can't read the handwriting. Somebody who lives at 14 Sands Point. 8 9 MR. BARKET: They don't live in Sands Point. Sands 10 Point Road in Muncie. They're all here Your Honor. 11 THE COURT: All right. Come on up and identify 12 yourselves please. Why don't you stand by the podium. Any 13 beneficiary that's got an interest in the Zellinger trust or 14 the premises located at 17 Locust Holland Drive in Muncie. 15 All right, could you just give me your names please. 16 MS. ROSENBERG: Deborah Rosenberg. 17 THE COURT: All right. MR. ROSENBERG: Joseph Rosenberg. 18 19 THE COURT: And what is your connection to the 20 trust? MR. ROSENBERG: She is beneficiary, I am just a 21 22 (inaudible) I have no connnection to the bond. 23 THE COURT: All right. 24 MS. DANZIGER: Deena Danziger (phonetic) beneficiary 25 to the trust.

Colloquy 24 THE COURT: All right. 1 2 MR. ZELLINGER: Jonathan Zellinger, beneficiary of 3 the trust. THE COURT: Now did, I have two signatures on this 4 5 bond, the original bond. Is that one of you? Did one or two 6 of you sign the original bond? 7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We all signed it. THE COURT: I only have two signatures here. 8 9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: There should be a second 10 page attached. 11 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (inaudible) beneficiaries 12 and the trustee signed for purposes of (inaudible). 13 THE COURT: And are they here? 14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah, they're here.--15 THE COURT: Wait a minute. I have, Danni Keer 16 (phonetic). 17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes. THE COURT: Oh, that's Danziger. Okay, I'm trying 18 19 to read it off of the signature, that's why it's hard. Mr. 20 Zellinger who's identified himself. Mr. Sklar for whom there is -- and is there a Delmar --21 22 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Deborah Rosenberg? 23 THE COURT: Oh, that could be it. Deborah 24 Rosenberg, maybe that's it. And then one more signature that 25 to me is illegible. Who would that be?

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That is the one from

Baltimore that you have the affidavit from.

THE COURT: No --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Joseph Rosenberg.

THE COURT: That could be. And is he here? Oh, is that you? Well let me see if that's your signature. Show him this. That's the other person. Okay, so we have everybody represented.

All right. There's been a large discussion here which you've been present for about the bail package. And it's of vital interest to you folks to know what the terms of the proposed release is and how they're being modified.

As you probably are all aware now, the defendant, I mean he was about to plead guilty to this. So and in addition there's been a finding of probable cause to believe that he is engaged in a fraud of investors to the tune of some \$60 million.

So those are the charges. They're not proven yet. The defendant has the right to go to trial on this. Although he did indicate yesterday that he might plead guilty. He hasn't done that yet. So he is presumed to be innocent as of the moment.

But I bring that information to your attention so that you're aware of some of the concerns that the Court had with respect to releasing the defendant.

Colloquy

He is and the Government has joined in an application and I'm going to order this, -- he's going to be released on bail. Now the bail conditions which I intend to set are going to set travel restrictions. They are going to be the eastern district of New York, the southern district of New York and New Jersey. Which means that he cannot travel outside of those areas.

Let me tell you what they are. The eastern district means Brooklyn, Long Island, Staten Island, Queens. The southern district is Manhattan, Westchester, White Plains and pretty much that's it. And the area of New Jersey which is where his other family, his family resides.

MR. BARKET: I'm sorry to interrupt Judge. They all live in Rockland County which I'm fairly certain is part of the southern district.

THE COURT: I believe you may be right. But I don't know how much, if all of Rockland County is.

MR. BARKET: I believe its Dutchess, Orange, Rockland and Westchester as well as Manhattan and the Bronx.

THE COURT: It gets a little fuzzy when you move upstate as to what's included. I agree with counsel that portions if not all of Rockland County is included.

But what's important for you to know is that that's it. He can't go to Connecticut. He can't go to Vermont. He can't travel any place else, but the areas that are

designated for his specific travel.

If he's outside of the areas that are designated for his specific travel, he's in violation of his bail which is a problem for you folks.

And the reason I'm telling you this is because if the defendant violates any of the conditions of bail, then you're in peril in terms of the assets that you've pledged.

The Government has asked and I'm going to, frankly I think I'm going to raise the amount of the bond to \$2 million. Because it was a million while he was under house arrest. I'm now going to raise the sum to \$2 million because he's going to be released for the better part of the day, from 6:00 a.m. till 10:00 p.m., not 12:00 as suggested. If he's doing business, it's more than adequate time within which to engage in business affairs.

Now, one of the major concerns the Court had was allowing this bail package to go forward, was what kind of business this defendant would be engaged in as he's released and during his release.

If he engages in any kind of elicit, fraudulent, unlawful activity during the course of his release, that would be a serious and material violation of his bail conditions. I've now arranged it to impose on his own attorney the obligation to report those transactions and any elicit transaction or unlawful, fraudulent or unethical

Colloquy

transaction to the Government so that the Government is made immediately aware of the fact that that's going on. And you folks are going to be the losers.

The minute that transgression occurs, the Government will be authorized to move against your property, your assets. And when I say your property, your assets, when you sign a bond for \$2 million, it's not limited to just the property that's in the trust. Anything you own. Your personal homes, your bank accounts, your cars, everything is in play.

And the Government can seize whatever property is available from any one of you or all of you or one of you, whoever's got the most. Whatever is the easiest to the tune of \$2 million.

So I tell you that because you have to have a lot of confidence in the defendant when you sign a bond for \$2 million. Because you're putting your personal finances at risk.

I'm also requiring as part of this package that he be subjected to random visits by pretrial services at any place of employment that he establishes. As you've already heard, pretrial services is going to be paying a visit to his home once a month. He's going to be required to report to pretrial services once a month. If he doesn't do it, it's a violation of bail.

violation of bail and you folks will be at risk.

Colloquy

If he doesn't show up to Court, any single day that's set, he's in violation of bail. And it won't matter if he shows up the next day. So if he's given a date to appear in Court on the 12th and he doesn't show up until the 13th, a warrant will be issued for his arrest. He will be in

And if he's arrested on any federal or state charges while he's out on bond, you folks once again at risk. So all of those triggers exist here and you need to be fully aware of them before you sign off on a bond here. Do you understand? Does anyone have a question about this?

And the properties, and I'll get to your question in a moment. The property that is the trust property, the specific property at 17 Locust Holland Drive that's being put up, or Locust Hollow Drive, sorry, may not be compromised in any way. Meaning it can't, you can't empty out the asset. You can't compromise the value of the asset. You can't get money against that asset. That asset remains untouched until this case is over, which could be years. It could be years.

So those are the conditions. Did you, you had a question.

UNIDENTIFIED: The only question I had is can you confer with (inaudible).

THE COURT: Absolutely. And you should confer with whomever, your spouses, whatever. Because it is a big

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

United States versus Barkany?

MR. CAFFARONE: Yes.

Colloquy 30 undertaking. And I tell you this just to make sure that you're very clear. And you don't come back six months from now saying I didn't understand. So if you have questions or concerns, discuss them with counsel or ask me because I'll be happy to clarify whatever you clarification on. MR. CAFFARONE: Your Honor did you also add the no gambling? THE COURT: Yes, there's no gambling. MR. CAFFARONE: Okay, thank you. THE COURT: And that's a very important condition Because as you may or may not be aware, there's an indication that the defendant has a gambling problem. If he so much as steps foot in one of those gambling houses, he's in violation of bail and the Government's coming after you folks. You're the hook here. That's why you're being asked to sign. And you better have confidence in this gentleman before you sign otherwise you're putting your finances at risk. Go ahead. (pause in proceedings) (Court hears another matter) (Recording resumed at 12:56:43)

THE COURT: All right, are we ready to continue on

Colloquy

THE COURT: All right. Let's have the, I'm going to have a new bond prepared and have the sureators -- are all the Sureators prepared to sign the bond? Does anybody have any additional questions?

All right, I'll let the record reflect they've all nodded their assent, okay. So bail formally is being set at \$2 million with the conditions of release as follows. Travel restrictions to the eastern and southern district of New York as well as New Jersey.

The defendant is, who is presently on house arrest, will be permitted to leave his residence from the hours of 6:00 to 10:00 p.m., not 12:00 as proposed by the Government. 10:00 p.m. is the cut off.

I'm permitting pretrial services to conduct random visits of the home and to continue with the current arrangement which is a visit once a month to his home as well as having the defendant appear at pretrial services once a month.

I'm permitting pretrial services to conduct random visits at the place of employment which the defendant is to disclose to the pretrial services once it's established. I understand he does not currently have an office, but plans to have one. That office should be disclosed to pretrial services.

To the extent that any bank accounts or financial

Colloquy

assets are established overseas, there is a continuing duty to disclose any accounts that might meet that definition.

While the defendant is on release, its reported to the Court that he intends to engage in business, business transactions I should say. The nature of which are going to be monitored by defense counsel's firm, Mr. Barket.

If it's reported by Mr. Barket that the defendant has agreed to a waiver of his attorney/client privilege to permit Mr. Barket to report to the Court or to the Government that is, not the Court, to the U.S. Attorney's Office any untoward, meaning elicit or illegal or transactions of a questionable nature which might constitute violations of law.

And that if there is any change, that is if at any point Mr. Barkany decides that he wants to change his waiver of attorney/client privilege, Mr. Barket is to report that to the Government and to the Court.

MR. BARKET: Your Honor, I'm sorry. You're saying a waiver of the attorney/privilege. It's a waiver of, he's waiving my, any ethical restraints that I might have in reporting a crime to the Government.

THE COURT: But presumably there's also some attorney/client privilege involved there as well.

MR. BARKET: Right, right, to the extent that it's necessary, that. But the broader attorney/client privilege will remain intact. I'm still representing him on a

pending

THE COURT: Yes, I understand.

MR. BARKET: Okay.

THE COURT: But it's limited to the subject matter we discussed which is his ongoing business transactions. And only to the extent that these business transactions are of, are subject matter or nature that raises questions as to their validity or their legality. And I want to make sure that it's clear that if there's a question as to the legality of a business transaction, that's what I expect Mr. Barket to report to the Government.

MR. BARKET: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And if for whatever reason the defendant withdraws his permission, you must advise us as well.

MR. BARKET: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. In addition, the Court is advised that the defendant may have a gambling addiction. I'm continuing the order previously entered that he may not enter a gambling establishment or participate in gambling of any kind during the period of his release.

And the usual conditions of bail also apply. That is, that if he's arrested on any federal or state charges while he's out on bail, then bail will be revoked and a new evaluation will be held as to what is the appropriate bail

1 condition for the defendant, if any.

And certainly if he fails to appear in Court on any date that's set, -- a warrant will be issued for his arrest and he will face additional charges of bail jumping, which are separate and independent from the ones he faces today.

Now, to review the sureator situation, I've been provided by Mr. Barket with affidavits signed by Juda Zellinger dated June 26th, 2013 as well as an affidavit signed by Daniel Sklar, the trustee, signed June 25th of 2013 indicating that they are aware of the modifications, -- not the specific ones because they indicate they were advised that Mr. Barkany would be permitted to leave his home between 6:00 and 12:00. It's actually 6:00 and 10:00. So I've modified that.

And I have, I have expanded the bail sum from a million to two million. So Mr. Barket, I would appreciate it if you would submit an additional affidavit from each of these individuals indicating that they're aware of the \$2 million bond.

MR. BARKET: Right, correct. Mr. Sklar is not a --

THE COURT: Right, he's --

MR. BARKET: He's signing only as a trustee.

THE COURT: No need from Mr. Sklar, but I need it from Juda Zellinger.

MR. BARKET: Correct.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Colloquy 35 THE COURT: All right. So I need an updated affidavit from Mr., is it Mr. or Mrs.? MR. BARKET: In Baltimore, Mr. Juda. THE COURT: All right. And then we have the Sureators who have presented here in Court. They are, let me see, I wrote their names down; Joseph Rosenberg, Deborah Rosenberg, Deena Danziger and Jonathan Zellinger. All of whom appear to be beneficiaries, except for Mr. Rosenberg, of the trust, the Zellinger trust. But all of whom have been advised of the risks that are involved with signing off on a \$2 million bond and are fully aware that their risk is not limited to the specific trust asset. I understand they're willing to sign the bond. So

we have to present the bond for their signature.

I also want to make clear that defendant may not apply for a passport during the pendency of this matter. I understand he surrendered his passport.

MR. CAFFARONE: Your Honor that applies to any country, passport, not just the United States. But applying for a passport --

THE COURT: Right. He has connections with Canada and Israel. So he may not obtain passports in those jurisdictions as well, those countries as well.

(pause in proceedings)

THE COURT: Mr. Barkany, I'm going to address you

Colloquy

directly because I want to make sure you understand everything that you're required to do under the terms of your release.

It starts with the travel restrictions to the eastern and southern district of New York as well as the District of New Jersey.

Now I've already outlined the eastern district,
Brooklyn, Queens, Long Island, Staten Island. The southern
district being Manhattan, the Bronx, White Plains,
Westchester, Rockland County. To the extent that all of
Rockland County, again Mr. Barket will give you a clearer
definition of what parts if not all of Rockland County is
included. But southern district is your limitation. You
may not travel outside of those areas without Court
permission.

You may not go into a gambling establishment or engage in gambling during your release. You may not apply for a passport in any jurisdiction or country. You've surrendered the one you already have.

And if you haven't already surrendered any passport you may have in another country, you must do so immediately. You are placed under the supervision of pretrial services. They are permitted to random visits. In addition to which you currently have reporting requirement of once a month in person to pretrial services. That's to continue. They may,

Colloquy

they will visit your home once a month as they've been doing in the past. And also are permitted random visits.

When it comes to the point where you establish a business, you are to report the location of that business to pretrial services. They will be permitted random visits to that location. And they will be permitted to access any financial information related to the operations of that business.

You may leave your home between the hours of 6:00 and 10:00 p.m. only. You are to disclose any assets or bank accounts that you may possess that or establish overseas. You are to come to Court on any dates that are set. If you fail to show up in Court on any date that's set, a warrant will be issued for your arrest and you will be faced with a new charge of bail jumping which is a separate and independent charge from the one you currently face.

If you are arrested on any federal or state charges while you are out on bail, that will constitute a violation of your bail. And the conditions of your release will be reexamined at that time.

Your bail has been set at \$2 million, secured by the signatures of the various Sureators who have appeared here today as well as the premises at 15 Locust Hollow Drive, Muncie, New York.

I think that's -- and most importantly while you

Colloguy 38

are on release from 6:00 to 10:00 p.m. as we've discussed here in Court and made very clear, to the extent that you engage in business transactions, your attorney, with your permission, which has been represented to the Court you've given, if Mr. Barket is, who is, who has pledged to monitor your activities of a business nature, if he becomes aware of any activities which are of a possible unlawful, fraudulent or unethical nature, you've given him permission to disclose that activity or the nature of that activity to the U.S. Attorney's Office. Do you understand the conditions of your release?

MR. BARKANY: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you have any questions about what you're required to do?

MR. BARKANY: No.

THE COURT: All right. All right, with respect to Mr. Barkany, is there any other application at this time?

MR. CAFFARONE: Not by the Government Your Honor.

MR. BARKET: One moment Your Honor.

(pause in proceedings)

MR. BARKET: Your Honor.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. BARKET: I think at this point we would like to proceed with a plea, if the Court has the time to do that.

THE COURT: We'll do it at 2:00 o'clock.

Barkany-Court 39 MR. CAFFARONE: The Government's available Your 1 2 Honor. MR. BARKET: I'll make myself available. 3 (Court hears other matters) 4 5 (Barkany proceeding resumes at 2:39:00) COURT CLERK: Calling 13-CR-362, the United States 6 7 of America against Gershon Barkany. Please state your 8 appearances. 9 MR. CAFFARONE: Chris Caffarone for the United States. Good afternoon Your Honor. 10 11 THE COURT: Yes. 12 MR. BARKET: Good afternoon again Your Honor, Bruce 13 Barket for Mr. Barkany. 14 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Barket, I understand 15 your client wishes to go forward with his plea? MR. BARKET: Yes, Your Honor. 16 THE COURT: So let's swear in the defendant. 17 18 COURT CLERK: Please rise. Raise your right hand. 19 DEFENDANT GERSHON BARKANY SWORN 20 EXAMINATION BY THE COURT: All right, Mr. Barkany first of all, on the stand, that 21 22 you have the right once again to ask Judge Wexler to take 23 your plea, correct? You know that? 24 Α Yes. 25 You have that right. Are you willing nonetheless to let

Barkany-Court 40 me take your plea? 1 2 Α Yes. And Judge Wexler being the Judge who would sentence you 3 normally would take a plea, but you're willing to let me do 4 5 it? 6 Α Yes. 7 All right. You had completed a form which we reviewed 8 yesterday. I just want to ask you just generally is there 9 any changes that you wish to make to any of the answers you gave on that form? 10 11 Α Yes. 12 0 There is? 13 Α Yes. 14 Q. And what would that change be? 15 I was asked if I was promised anything in return for my Α plea and yesterday I answered yes. And today I switched my 16 17 answer to no. 18 Well, I'm going to go through the whole allocution with 19 you. We need to do that. But is there any of the written 20 answers that you provided, did you need to change any of the

22 A No.

21

- 23 Q Do you want to look at this again?
- 24 A No. No, thank you.

written answers?

25 Q All right. Well we're going to go over it anyway

```
Barkany-Court
                                                                  41
     orally, so. Just tell me how old you are.
 1
          29.
 2
     Α
          And how far did you get in school?
 3
 4
     Α
         High school.
 5
     Q
          Okay. Now are you presently under the care of any
 6
     doctor or psychiatrist?
 7
     Α
          No.
 8
     Q
         Yes?
 9
     Α
         No.
10
          Okay. What about medications, pills, alcohol, anything
     Q.
11
     in the last 24 hours?
12
     Α
          No.
          Are you on any medications or pills of any type
13
14
     regardless of the 24 hour time line?
15
     Α
          No.
          So you're not taking anything?
16
     Q
17
     Α
          No.
18
          Have you ever been hospitalized or treated for narcotics
     addiction?
19
20
     Α
          No.
21
          Is your mind clear today?
     Q
22
     Α
          Yes.
23
     Q
          And you understand why you're here?
24
     Α
          Yes.
25
               THE COURT: Mr. Barket, have you discussed this
```

Barkany-Court 42 matter with your client? 1 2 MR. BARKET: Yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: And does he understand the rights he'd 3 be waiving by pleading guilty? 4 5 MR. BARKET: I believe he does. 6 THE COURT: And is he capable of understanding the nature of these proceedings? 7 8 MR. BARKET: I believe he is. 9 THE COURT: So in your opinion is he competent to 10 plead at this time? 11 MR. BARKET: I believe yes. 12 THE COURT: All right. 13 BY THE COURT: 14 Mr. Barkany I want to advise you you still have the 15 right to plead not guilty, do you understand that? 16 Α Yes. 17 And if you pled not guilty under the constitution and laws of the United States, you'd be entitled to a speedy and 18 19 public trial by jury, with the assistance of your attorney to 20 defend you in that case, do you understand that? 21 Α Yes. 22 And at a trial, you'd presumed to be innocent and it 23 would be up to the Government to overcome that presumption 24 and prove you guilty by competent evidence and beyond a 25 reasonable doubt. And you would not have to prove that

you're innocent because you're presumed innocent. And if the Government failed in its proof, the jury would have a duty to find you not guilty. Do you understand that?

A Yes.

- Q Now, what would happen at a trial is the Government would have to bring its witnesses to testify in your presence. Your attorney could object to the evidence that the Government offers. Your attorney would be entitled to cross examine the Government's witnesses. And your attorney could offer evidence on your behalf. Do you understand that?
- 11 A Yes.
 - Q Although because you're presumed innocent, you would have absolutely no obligation to present any evidence at all.

 Do you understand that?
- 15 A Yes.
 - Q If the Government, after offering its evidence failed in its burden to prove your guilt beyond a reasonable doubt, as you know, the jury would have a duty to find you not guilty. You understand that?
 - \mathbb{A} Yes.
 - Q Now, at a trial you would have the right to testify if you wanted to do that. But you couldn't be required to testify because you have the right not to incriminate yourself. That's the constitutional right you possess. Do you understand that?

A Yes.

Q So if you decided not to testify the Court would instruct the jury that they could not hold that decision against you in their consideration of the verdict of the case. Do you understand that?

A Yeah, yes.

Q But if you plead guilty and the Court accepts this plea, you'd be giving up the constitutional rights to a trial, the presumption of innocence, the right not to incriminate yourself, these rights that we've discussed. There'd be no further trial of any kind. And no right to appeal or collaterally attack at any time the question of whether or not you're guilty. Do you understand that?

A Yes.

Q And the other aspect of this is as a consequence of an agreement that you have with the Government, which we're going to discuss in a moment, you've also given up your right to appeal the sentence of the Court to the extent that the sentence is 121 months or less, do you remember that?

A Yes.

Q So as a hypothetical, if Judge Wexler sentenced you to 121 months in prison, you would have absolutely no right to appeal any component of this case, meaning your guilt or the sentence of the Court. Do you understand?

 \mathtt{A} Yes.

Q Do you also understand that if you plead guilty I'm going to be asking you questions about what you did in order to satisfy myself that you are in fact guilty of the crime that you wish to plead guilty to. And in answering those questions, you'd be giving up your right not to incriminate yourself. Do you understand that?

A Yes.

- Q So are you willing to give up your right to a trial and these other rights that I've just discussed with you?
- A Yes.
- Q All right.

THE COURT: Now, the Government, I'm going to ask once again to outline the plea agreement for the record.

MR. CAFFARONE: Yes, Your Honor. The plea agreement, the defendant will get coverage from the Government. The Government agrees not to prosecute him for check kiting as well as the wire mail fraud that he committed between January 2007 and March 2013.

In addition in exchange as Your Honor noted, he has agreed to an appellate waiver of 121 months. The defendant also agreed to forfeit, to an entry of money judgment in the amount of \$62 million, less any monies or assets that are repaid to victims. So he agrees to forfeit \$62 million.

BY THE COURT:

Q All right. And Mr. Barkany I want to confirm you read

the plea agreement, correct?

A Yes.

Q And you reviewed it with your attorney before you signed it?

A Yes.

Q And you understood what the plea agreement provided?

A Yes.

Q Okay. As we reviewed yesterday, I want to go over the penalties that are associated with the charge you're pleading guilty to which is a charge of mail fraud or a violation of Title 18, United States Code Section 1343, which carries a maximum term of imprisonment of 20 years with a minimum term of imprisonment of zero. A maximum supervised release term of three years to follow any term of imprisonment. A maximum fine of \$250,000 or twice the gross gain or gross loss from the offense.

Restitution, which is in an amount to be determined by the Court. A \$100 mandatory special assessment as well as the criminal forfeiture which the Government has outlined.

Now, one of the things we discussed yesterday and I want to go over with you again is the sentencing guidelines. Your sentencing guidelines as calculated by the Government is an adjusted offense level of 30 which carries a range of imprisonment of 97 to 121 months. You're aware of that, correct?

A Yes.

Q Now, that's the Government's calculation. And as I've already explained and I will explain again, just to make sure you're clear, that is the Government's best guess. That's all it is. It's a guess.

And what will happen is you're going to go to probation and probation is going to do a full and comprehensive review of your background and the circumstances of this case. And they will do a calculation of the guideline range that applies in your case.

It may be the same as the Government's or even your attorney. I'm not sure what your attorney's told you. But if your attorney has told you that he agrees with the Government, it's important that you know that probation's going to do their own calculation. It may be similar to, different from. All of this information will go to Judge Wexler who will assess everything and make a final conclusion as to what your guideline range is.

If Judge Wexler decides that your guideline range is different from what's been estimated by your attorney and the Government, you do not have a basis to withdraw your plea.

In other words, don't rely on the Government's estimate or your own attorney's estimate because they're educated guesses at best. Do you understand that?

25 A Yes.

Q The one who's going to make a decision about this is

Judge Wexler who will review all the information. And it

will be up to Judge Wexler to decide what the sentence will

be. He is not bound by the guidelines. He could, because he

has the authority, decide that the guidelines should pierced,

meaning he should go upward beyond what the guidelines

provide.

Or he could decide that they're too severe and he could sentence you downwardly, meaning less than what the guidelines provide. Do you understand all that?

A Yes.

Q At the end of the day nobody knows what your sentence is going to be. So that to the extent that you think you can rely on the estimate provided by the Government or your own, even your own attorney, I'm telling you that you can't because nobody is sure what your ultimate sentence will be and what the guidelines will provide. Do you understand that?

A Yes.

Q And if your sentence turns out to be more severe than any calculation you've been given or estimate you've been given, that will not provide a basis for withdrawing your plea of guilty. Do you understand?

A Yes.

Q Now one of the things that I've already told you is the

49

Government has to prove your quilt beyond a reasonable doubt. 1 2 Here's what they have to prove. That between December 2007 3 and March 2013, that you knowingly and intently devised a scheme and artifice to defraud investors by means of 4 5 intentionally false and fraudulent pretenses. And that you transmitted or caused to be transmitted by wire transfer 6 7 across state lines, matters that furthered the scheme to defraud. And that part of this activity was done in the 8 9 Eastern District of New York. Do you understand that?

- 10 A Yes.
- 11 Q So do you understand the charge that you intend to plead 12 quilty to?
- 13 A Yes.
- Q All right. And have you discussed that charge with your attorney?
- 16 A Yes.
- Q Do you have any questions about anything we've discussed up to this point?
- 19 A No.
- 20 Q Are you ready to enter a plea?
- 21 A Yes.

22

23

24

THE COURT: Mr. Barket, do you know of any legal reason why the defendant should not be permitted to plead guilty?

MR. BARKET: No.

Barkany-Court 50 Mr. Barkany, are you satisfied with your legal 1 Q 2 representation up to this point? 3 Yes. Α Then with respect to the information that was filed by 4 5 the Government charging you with a violation of Title 18 6 United States Code Section 1343, what is your plea? 7 Α Guilty. And are you entering this plea of guilty voluntarily and 8 9 of your own free will? 10 Α Yes. 11 Has anyone threatened or forced you to plead guilty? 12 Α No. 13 Other than the agreement with the Government which we've 14 described on the record both today and yesterday, has anyone 15 made any promises to cause you to plead quilty? 16 Α No. 17 Has anyone made any promise to you as to what your sentence will be? 18 19 Α No. 20 So did you as charged in the information. On or about and between December 2009 and March 2013, those being 21 22 approximate dates, did you knowingly and intentionally within the Eastern District of New York devise a scheme and artifice 23

to defraud investors and to obtain money and property by

means of false and fraudulent pretenses. And did you use the

24

wire transfers via the Federal Reserve network to execute that scheme to defraud?

A Yes.

- Q Those wire transfers being in the amount of approximately \$13 million on June 14th, 2010 and another wire transfer in the amount of \$500,000 on or about February 15th, 2013? Were those wire transfers transfers that you made or caused to be made in connection with the scheme to defraud? A Your Honor, I don't recall specific dates or amounts. But I did in fact on at least one occasion engage in a scheme to defraud at least one person out of money in the Eastern District by telling them something that wasn't true and having them send money over the Federal interstate wire system and across through different states.
- Q But was it within the time frame that we described?
- 16 A Yes, Your Honor.
 - Q All right. So I want you to expand and tell me in your own words what it is you did. How you effected this scheme.
 - A I told at least one person that I was going to invest their money, but did not use the money as I represented to that person that I would. Instead I diverted those funds in other directions.
 - Q Well, what did you tell that person? How were you going to use that money?
 - A In one instance I may have represented --

Barkany-Court 52 You may have or you did? 1 2 I'm sorry. One instance I would have represented to 3 that investor that I was going to utilize specifically his funds to invest in project X, you know, and describe a 4 5 transaction to him. And instead of doing so, I would either have, I would have not used it for that and used it for other 6 7 things. 8 All right. Who was this, what was the name of that 9 investor? John Doe 1 as known to the Government let's say. 10 11 Well did you know who the investor was? Q 12 Α Absolutely, sure. 13 Well who was the investor? Q 14 Α Can I ask my attorney a question? 15 Q. Sure. (Court and counsel confer) 16 17 MR. BARKET: Your Honor I think that they were put in as John Doe number 1 and number 2. They don't want their 18 names identified in a public filing. The Government knows 19 20 them. We know them. But we'd rather --THE COURT: Well let me hear from the Government. 21 22 Mr. Caffarone is there any reason at this point for them to 23 remain undisclosed? 24 MR. CAFFARONE: Your Honor the victims are sensitive

to their name being disclosed. Generally, I mean, they have

asked us not to include their name in Court filings and we've, we've talked to the victims. And oftentimes we have to talk sometimes to their counsel as well.

I think it has to do with the community that they're in. They're very sensitive to their name being involved in being defrauded. I don't think its, obviously the U.S. Attorney knows who the victim is. We've been in contact with the victim. The defendant knows who the victim is.

For purposes of the allocution, I don't think it's a necessary element to it. And if we can protect the victim's privacy, then I would ask Your Honor to at least to agree to that.

THE COURT: Well, I'd be happy to.

BY THE COURT:

- Q Well then with respect to John Doe 1, tell me what you did. I need some specifics.
- A On at least one occasion I presented him with a set of information with regards to a deal, telling him that he should invest his money in it.
- Q What kind of a deal was it?
- A A real estate transaction.
- Q All right. So he gave you thinking or the John Doe gave you money thinking he was investing in real estate, correct?
- 25 A John Doe 1 gave me money thinking that that money was

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Barkany-Court 54 going specifically to the real estate deal that I represented to him. All right. And where did these conversations or where was this real estate located? On one occasion the real estate was located in Manhattan. All right. And where did you engage in these transactions or discussions? I was in the Eastern District of New York at the time that I conversed with the, with John Doe 1 about that. All right. And how much money were you entrusted by John Doe to invest in that real estate deal? Α 14.5 million. All right. And then what did you do with the 14.5 million? I used it for, I diverted it in other directions than where I represented specifically to John Doe 1 that I was going to be using it for. Q. All right. So at no point did you use the money, the 14.5 million, in accordance with what you were telling John Doe, correct? A Not all of it. Q. What does that mean?

MR. BARKET: The actual transactions Judge are not

simple. They were, what happened to the money after he

Barkany-Court 55 received it, it got diverted to a variety of different 1 2 places. THE COURT: I understood that. 3 But the simple question I've asked is did you use any 4 5 portion of the 14.5 towards acquiring the real estate you 6 said you were going to get for John Doe 1? 7 Α No. 8 All right. And so did you mislead, John Doe, whoever 9 John Doe is, one, did you intentionally deceive him, that party? It might not have been a him, a he, she? Did you 10 11 take the money with the intent to defraud him? 12 (Client and counsel confer) 13 MR. BARKET: I'm sorry Judge, could you repeat the 14 question? Did you take the money, the 14.5 million from John Doe 1 15 with the intent to defraud him? 16 17 As defined under the current federal statutes, yes. 18 Well, I'm not sure that your definition of the current statute is the same as the Court's. So please tell me when 19 20 you took the money from Mr. John Doe, you told him you were 21 going to put it into a real estate deal, correct? 22 Α Yes. 23 When you took the money, did you ever intend to put it 24 into that real estate deal?

On at least one occasion Your Honor I acted with

Barkany-Court 56 intention to defraud John Doe 1, yes. 1 2 Q. Well, so not, on one occasion with respect to the 14.5 million? 3 MR. BARKET: Your Honor, I'm sorry, the transactions 4 5 were multiple. They are complex. All of the money didn't 6 all, wasn't all diverted in a way that would have been illegal. 7 8 His intent --9 THE COURT: Well that's what I'm trying to find out. MR. BARKET: But it's, with all, I don't think it, 10 11 it is, I think sufficient for the purposes of the plea 12 allocution --13 THE COURT: Please don't tell me what's sufficient. 14 MR. BARKET: I'm not telling you what you should 15 accept. I'm saying what I think. And in this particular 16 instance, you're asking him general questions about all of 17 the money and the answers, the question doesn't allow for a simple yes or no answer to all of that. 18 19 THE COURT: Then Mr., you explain it to me in more 20 specific terms that you're comfortable with. But to say that I took money from John Doe X and used it for something is 21 22 insufficient. So go ahead and tell me in your own words what 23 you did or how this fraudulent transaction occurred. 24 MR. BARKET: He took --

THE COURT: Not you Mr. Barket, your client. He's

```
Barkany-Court
                                                                 57
     pleading guilty.
 1
 2
               MR. BARKET: He has --
               THE COURT: I wanted to know what he did.
 3
               MR. BARKET: Judge and he's explained to you what
 4
 5
     he's done. You're asking --
               THE COURT: In such generic and general terms that I
 6
 7
     don't understand it. So I want more specifics.
               MR. BARKET: We can give you more specifics if you
 8
     give us a moment. But he can't --
 9
10
               THE COURT: I'd be happy to.
11
               MR. BARKET: He can't respond to your questions the
12
     way they're being asked in a way --
13
               THE COURT: Then you --
14
               MR. BARKET: Within the context of this plea because
     frankly to work out all of these transactions took many
15
     hours, many days to figure out where all the money went.
16
               THE COURT: Fine. Then have him explain it in his
17
     words. And if I need some, more information, I'll ask.
18
19
                (Client and counsel confer)
20
     BY THE COURT:
         Your Honor.
21
     Α
22
     Q
          Yes.
23
          Can I say over again, give an example of a scenario with
24
     John Doe 1?
25
          Yes, go ahead. I'd like to hear what you're going to
```

tell me.

A On one occasion I went to John Done 1. I presented him with a real estate transaction in Manhattan. At the time I, at some point in time during my conversations with him about this particular transaction, I was in the Eastern District of New York. I asked him for \$7 million to do a real estate transaction, to invest in a real estate transaction. I specifically gave him the address, the location, et cetera, of that specific real estate deal.

My intention while asking him for the money to invest in that specific real estate deal was so that I would use that money elsewhere and not for that real estate deal.

As such, it was my intention to defraud him while ultimately of course, I wanted to pay him back. But I'm saying, I used the money for something different than what I represented to him.

- Q Okay. It's charged in the information as I read it that you told investors that you would use their investment capital to purchase properties in New York and New Jersey that you would subsequently sell for a profit. Did you say that to both John Doe and John Doe 1 and 2, is that correct?

 A Yes.
- Q And did you claim that the sellers of those properties would only close on the real estate sales contracts after you had located a purchaser who'd be willing to buy the property

at a higher price?

A No.

Q I'm reading right from the information.

A Your Honor the substance of the charge is, I'm just answering the questions truthfully. I am guilty of committing 18, 1343, you know. It's just, it's not exactly how the transaction itself works. It was a mistake just to how it was exactly written, but it doesn't speak to the substance of the charge. The deals in fact existed. The bottom line is though that I made certain representations to investors that were false.

Q All right.

THE COURT: Mr. Caffarone what is your evidence here? Because I'm having a very difficult time eliciting an allocution from the defendant that's satisfactory.

MR. CAFFARONE: Yes, Your Honor. The evidence is that the defendant as stated in the information on a number of occasions, represented to John Doe 1 and John Doe 2 that he was going to take their money and use it for particular real estate investments. Not just real estate generally, particular addresses. Told them I'm using your money and I'm going to purchase this property. And then didn't use it for that purpose. He sent it to other victims to pay, you know, victims from a prior Ponzi scheme or other investors. He used it to gamble. He used it for, to donate to charity.

Barkany-Court

In addition Your Honor, in the course of the fraud,

John Doe 2 specifically, he provided them with documents, a

purchase agreement that purported to be a purchase agreement

between the seller of a property that he said he was

purchasing and the victims.

That agreement, we've spoken to the seller of the property who said we didn't enter that agreement. That's not our signature. Mr. Barkany had contacted us months earlier about the property, but we haven't engaged in any negotiations. We certainly haven't agreed orally or otherwise to sell him this property.

In addition in that fraud, the John Doe number 2, he created an escrow agreement that was supposed to be a third party agreement with the escrow agent that was going to hold the monies until they had closed on the property. So the third party escrow agent was to insure that the funds only went to their intended purpose which was the purchase of the property.

We've contacted that third party escrow agent.

They have said they didn't enter into that agreement. That that agreement was not their signature. And the monies went into an account that was controlled by the defendant. The defendant had created a bank account I think it was with TD Bank and put it in the name of the third party escrow agent.

That wasn't the third party escrow agent's account, it was

the defendant's.

I believe during the course of a search warrant, we found some of these fraudulent documents as well in the defendant's office. In addition to all of that evidence, the defendant back in December --

THE COURT: Well hold on. How many, how many of these real estate deals did you find?

MR. CAFFARONE: We found, we talked to at least two of the owners where the owner said this deal was not, we never made a deal to sell this property to Mr. Barkany or any of the victims.

THE COURT: Okay. And how many deals were pitched to both John Doe 1 and 2?

THE DEFENDANT: There were a number of deals that were pitched; three to John Doe 1 and yeah, John Doe 2 had other deals unrelated to the monies that we charged in the information.

So there were some legitimate deals within, that Mr. Barkany had actually done with some of these, some of these victims. And there are some that we're just not clear, we hadn't spoken to the purchaser but that are not contained within the --

THE COURT: But there were multiple deals with John Doe 1 and John Doe 2 for real estate.

MR. CAFFARONE: Yes, correct.

THE COURT: Which were just bogus deals, correct?

MR. CAFFARONE: Completely shams, yes.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. CAFFARONE: And Your Honor I was, in addition to that evidence that I laid out, August 2011 the defendant signed an affidavit that was notarized where he admits to defrauding John Doe 1 and the other victims that were part, that also gave him money as part of the, what I call the first set of victims.

We didn't include all of them in the information. We only included John Doe 1.

In addition to the 46 and a half million dollars, he got another \$8 million from other victims. And in an affidavit he admits to repeatedly engaging, and I'm quoting, in fraudulent and unauthorized practices and conveyances which victimized the creditors.

He employed a variety of means in this fraud including the solicitations of funds for real estate and loan transactions which unbeknownst to plaintiffs were not as represented or all together non-existent.

You know, we had laid all this out in the complaints. So that would be our evidence. I'm sure we have other evidence as well. We recovered a number of records from his or from his office that we haven't even had a chance to go through. But at a minimum that's what we would proven

Barkany-Court 63 had this case gone to trial or if this case goes to trial. 1 BY THE COURT: 2 So Mr. Barkany did you hear the Government's outline 3 here? 4 5 Α Yes. I'm having a difficult time understanding why you're not 6 7 able to allocute in this case. Did you --8 THE COURT: No, Mr. Barket I'm not addressing you. 9 I'm addressing your client because it's him who is pleading 10 quilty. And it's necessary that he outline the fraud that 11 was engaged in. 12 MR. BARKET: He --13 THE COURT: And the scope of the fraud. 14 MR. BARKET: He has Your Honor. THE COURT: He has not to the Court's satisfaction. 15 So if we're done, we're done. Are we done? 16 MR. BARKET: You can ask more questions if you like 17 Judge. He's happy to answer them truthfully as he has so 18 19 far. 20 BY THE COURT: I want the defendant and I'm going to give you your last 21 chance because after this I'm not going to try it again. I'm 22 23 not, I don't want to be pulling teeth. If you're not willing 24 to plead guilty to the contures of the offense, so be it. 25 You're either to describe what you did or I'm leaving.

So what did you do? I don't want, you know, it's not enough to say well I, whatever you said thus far is insufficient.

This is a fairly large scheme to defraud. You haven't really allocuted to a fairly large scheme to defraud. So, please, if you want to say something to the Court, you should do it right now.

(Client and counsel confer)

- A Okay. Your Honor may I?
- Q Yes, go ahead.

- A Much of what the United States, what Mr. Caffarone said in open court just now is accurate and is what happened unfortunately. I, like he also mentioned, there's been, you know, a tremendous amount of deals that went on between my investors and myself, -- some of which were completely legitimate. And unfortunately many of them as well that were vehicles under which I used to separate money from my investors. And --
- Q When you say separate money, -- do you mean steal money?

 Because that's what I want to hear, if that's what --
- A Yes, I'm actually -- I was just quoting from that thing.

 From that paper that he read from.
 - Q Okay, well don't use euphoniums. Separate from my investors is not the same as admitting that stole money from them.
- 25 A Your Honor the truth is I'm not an attorney. But what I

am here to do today and with, very difficult to do it because of, you know, I've been doing this for quite a few years.

I am guilty of violating this, this thing that I'm charged with.

Q You see it is, what you're not understanding is that I have to be satisfied that you are guilty, not you. And so I ask you to tell me, and this is why we do, to tell me the facts. Tell me the actions that you did so that I can make a finding that you were in fact guilty of the crime you're wishing to plead guilty to.

Because ultimately it becomes somewhat of a legal assessment. And it's the Court's responsibility to insure that you're pleading guilty to a crime you actually committed.

A Okay.

Q That's why we insist on some detail. And so for you to say I'm guilty is inadequate. Or that I separated you know money from my investors is inadequate. Because what's lacking in that is that it's intentional. That it's done knowingly. That it was done with the intent to defraud, to steal from your investors. That you never intended to take the money and put it into the investments you represented you were going to do for them. And you knew that when you took the money. Those are the elements that have to be established.

And not just for one transaction. You've got a \$60 million plus allegation here. Now, I don't need you to detail all \$63 million worth of the transactions. But certainly you should have enough information at your disposal that you're able to say that large swaths of money were taken from these investors. And at the moment you took their money, you either lied to them or you knew you weren't going to use it for the purposes that you represented. Or that you gave them false documents to con them into giving you the money and entrusting you.

Those are the elements that have to be allocuted to in order for me to accept this plea. So all of That has to be folded into this. Now if you want time to reconsider this, fine. I'm going to call a recess now and let you think about this so that you can pull it together.

MR. BARKET: Judge, there's no thought about whether or not he wants to plead guilty. He wants to. The problem arises that you're asking, you asked him specific questions that called for answers --

THE COURT: I'm done. I'm done.

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor just to answer your question, I do want to speak to my attorney first.

THE COURT: If you want ten minutes to get an allocution together, that's fine. But I have, I gave you the -- I asked questions and then you said okay, well then just.

Barkany-Court

And then I invited you to come and explain it to me. I'm doing it both ways. I have never taken so much time with a plea.

And never have I been with a defendant who was so unwilling to allocute, okay, to describe the fraud. You've got a \$63 million fraud you're charged with and I can't get any elements out of you.

So I'm not sure if it's because you don't want to admit to what you did. If that's the case, then you shouldn't be pleading guilty.

Okay, so take ten minutes. Talk to your lawyer.

Talk to the Government. You know what I'm looking for. If
you're not able to provide it because it's not true, then
don't say it. If you're not willing to say it because you
just prefer not to, then we will void this plea again.

But you got to think about what you want to tell the Court. All right, we'll see you at 3:30.

(Recording paused at 3:18:46)

(Recording resumed at 3:27:43)

THE COURT: All right, we're back on the record. BY THE COURT:

- Q Mr. Barkany do you have something you want to describe to the Court?
- A Yes. On or about May 3rd of 2010 I, or just a few days before that, I spoke with John Doe 1. Presented him with a

deal at 335 Madison Avenue in New York City. At the time that, most of the time that I was discussing with him that deal I was in the Eastern District of New York.

That deal I told him I was going to be contract on and attempting to assign it to a third party for a profit. I told him that for a specific of time, there will be a due diligence period under which our deposit that we'd be handing to seller would be fully refundable. In the event that we decided not to proceed with the transaction we will be able to get back our money. There's no risk to us here except for the time loss and having the money to available elsewhere.

I made representations to him that I'll be entering into a contract to purchase the property. That the money will be held by a third party escrow agent or an attorney representing the seller perhaps. And I told him that at all times his money will be safe and secure.

My intention while telling him this was to induce him to give me that 7 million, to give me money. My intention while telling him this was two fold. One was ultimately maybe to give him back the money. But at the time that I was telling it to him, I knowingly told him to give me that money while knowing that for that specific deal I was not going to put the money into that deal.

And there's no way he would give me necessarily that money just by telling him that I wanted to use it elsewhere

or use it for my own benefit or use it for gambling, or use it to pay back other investors, right.

So he gave it to me specifically because of the fact that I told him it was going to be for this deal. It was going to be under a protected environment, the money, such as an escrow agent or some other kind of fiduciary.

Additionally, yeah, I mean, he went into the deal knowing full faith and confidence that his money will be protected. And there's no way that his money would ever be lost or otherwise not available to be given back to him at the time that he was expecting to originally receive it back.

And in fact, subsequent to those conversations with John Doe 1, he wired at my direction \$7 million. And I subsequently completely misappropriated those funds and did not use it for the, and did not use that money for the purposes of why he sent it to me. And I misrepresented the facts all together as relates to my presentation to him. And for --

Q And then with respect to John Doe 1 and 2, were there other transactions with those individuals that you did, made representations to those individuals to secure funds from them which at the time you made the representations you knew were false?

A Yes.

Q All right. And those monies that you obtained under

70

false pretenses from either John Doe 1 or 2, other than the one you described, were those monies wire transferred to you, to your account or to account --

- A They were, some were wire transfers, sure. Some were, for the most part nowadays people do -- yes.
- Q Okay. So some were wire transferred. But wire transfers were effected, correct?
- 8 A Yes, yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

13

14

15

18

19

20

21

22

23

- Q And these conversations with John Doe 1 and 2, did some of those conversations or transactions occur in the Eastern District of New York?
- 12 A Yes.
 - Q And with respect to those other transactions now, did you, that is, did you divert funds to other purposes than what you told them the monies were going to be used for?
- 16 A Yes.
- 17 Q All right.
 - THE COURT: Mr. Caffarone we've already gone through the Government's evidence. I think that with that specificity as to the count and with his admission to the general scheme, I believe there's sufficient information in the allocution, but I'll hear from you.
 - MR. CAFFARONE: I agree Your Honor. The Government agrees that it satisfies the charged crime.
- 25 THE COURT: All right. And it is the basis as I

Colloquy 71 understand it for the \$63 million forfeiture, is that right? 1 2 MR. CAFFARONE: Yes, Your Honor. 3 THE COURT: All right. MR. CAFFARONE: Yes, the \$63 million is the monies 4 5 that John Doe 1, -- the first set of victims, gave to the defendant as the basis --6 7 THE COURT: 62 million, I'm sorry. BY THE COURT: 8 9 And you, I saw a reaction from you Mr. Barkany. What was the reaction? 10 11 I'm sorry Judge? 12 I don't know. He, I thought that he took exception 13 to the Government's claim that this scheme that was outlined 14 was the basis for the \$62 million forfeiture. No, that is the basis for the forfeiture. 15 16 Okay, that is all I need to know. Q THE COURT: All right, after hearing the 17 defendant's allocution and the Government's evidence, I find 18 19 that there is a factual basis for the plea. I find that the 20 defendant has knowingly and voluntarily entered into this 21 plea and fully understands the consequences and rights that 22 he has. And the consequences of the plea. And I therefore 23 accept his plea of guilty to the information, and would

All right. I think that should be all. Is there

recommend that Judge Wexler do the same.

24

72 Court/plea anything else from the Government? 1 2 MR. CAFFARONE: No, Your Honor. THE COURT: Mr. Berket any other application? 3 MR. BARKET: No, just I would like to be present or 4 5 a member of firm be present when he is interviewed by 6 probation. 7 THE COURT: Typically I don't pass that information 8 to probation. Just make your client is aware, and insists on 9 that when he is called by probation. I don't have a sentencing date. That will be 10 11 provided. Typically what Judge Wexler does is after he waits 12 for the probation report and sends for a sentencing date. 13 All right, anything else I have to address. 14 MR. CAFFARONE: No, Your Honor, thank you. 15 MR. BERKET: No, thank you. 16 THE COURT: All right, thank you. 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

CERTIFICATION

I, TRACY GRIBBEN, court approved transcriber, certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the official electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter.

/S/ TRACY GRIBBEN

TERRY GRIBBEN'S TRANSCRIPTION SERVICE DATE: July 24, 2013